## APPEAL NO. 021217 FILED JUNE 24, 2002

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LA	٩В
CODE ANN. § 401.001 et seq. (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on A	pri
23, 2002. The hearing officer determined that (1) the respondent (claimant) sustaine	d a
compensable injury in the form of an occupational disease with a date of injury	0
; and (2) the claimant had disability from, throu	ıgh
the date of the hearing. The appellant (carrier) appeals these determinations	or
sufficiency of the evidence grounds. The claimant urges affirmance.	

## DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant sustained a compensable injury in the form of an occupational disease with a date of injury of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and had disability from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, through the date of the hearing. These were questions of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence (Section 410.165(a)) and, as the trier of fact, resolves the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence, including the medical evidence (Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ)). In view of the evidence presented, we cannot conclude that the hearing officer's determinations are so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986). The hearing officer could consider the evidence of the extensive periods of time the claimant drove as well as the opinion of Dr. V on causation.

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the carrier is **AMERICAN PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

## CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY 800 BRAZOS AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701.

NCUR:
Daniel R. Barry Appeals Judge
Appeals stude
Thomas A Knapp
Thomas A. Knapp Appeals Judge